

Measuring the Quality of Linguistic Access Services

Leo F. Estrada, PhD

UCLA School of Public Policy and
Social Research

Background

● **Year 1 (FY 01-02)** – Cultural and linguistic information included for first time on State of California HMO Report Card.

- Telephone Interpreters
- Face-to-Face Interpreters
- Bilingual Provider List
- Translated Written Materials
- Monitoring Grievances/Complaints

● **Year 2 (FY 02-03)** – Survey revised; descriptive data included on HMO Report Card.

Year 3 Survey

Year 3 (FY 03 – 04)

- Survey revised with intention to develop quality/performance ratings for health plans similar to those on the existing HMO Report Card.

Objective

To develop a rating system that is useful to consumers who seek to compare Plans on their efforts to provide appropriate linguistic services for LEP members

Criteria for the Rating System

- It has to be consumer oriented
- It has to be conceptually cohesive
- It has to differentiate between levels of effort among HMOs
- It has to incorporate a system to compare HMOs that offer different lines of business
- It has to use a methodology that is easily explained and independently verifiable

5 Rating Categories

● Communicating with your HMO and doctor

- *“Does the Plan provide face-to-face interpreter services at medical points of contact?”*

● Availability of Written Materials in your Language

- *“Does the Plan have a Directory that specifies non-English languages spoken by the provider?”*

● Information on Services and Costs

- *“Are face-to-face interpreter services provided free for LEP members?”*

● Interpreter Abilities

- *“Does the Plan require that contracted interpreters be certified?”*

● Organizational Effort

- *“Does the Plan have written policies on the provision of language interpreter services beyond the grievance process?”*

Methodology

● Consistency Checks

- Data Validity
- Data Reliability

● Item Scoring Decisions

● Item Analysis

- Discriminate Analysis

● Review and Report Findings

Example of Proposed Rating System

Linguistic Access Services Rating

Plan Name	Communicating with your HMO and doctor	Availability of Written Materials in your Language	Information on Services and Cost	Interpreter Abilities	Organizational Effort
A	★ ★ ★	★	★ ★ ★	★ ★	★ ★
B	★ ★	★ ★ ★	★	★ ★	★ ★ ★
C	★	★ ★	★ ★ ★	★ ★	★ ★ ★
Etc...

Excellent ★ ★ ★

Good ★ ★

Fair ★

Poor ★

Another Tool for Patient Advocacy

- Exploratory effort in California
- Team of UCLA researchers involved
- Work in progress – still in development stage
- Potential for use for Year 4 (FY 2004–05)
HMO Report Card
- Comments:

CReifman@dmhc.ca.gov